

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Michael Gregg-Wilson,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	C/A No.: 3:15-cv-807-TLW
vs.)	
)	
Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP; Sue)	
Erwin Harper; Foley & Lardner LLP; Christina)	
M. Kennedy; John S. Lord, Jr; Duff White and)	
Turner LLC; David T. Duff; Joseph Daniel)	
Dickey, Jr.; EFC Trade Inc.; Duncan M.)	
Anderson; James Herbst; Jennifer Yarnell;)	
Abraham J. Turner; Romi Y. Robinson; Leland)	
M. Caulder, Jr.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

Plaintiff Michael Gregg-Wilson, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this action on February 25, 2015, alleging violation of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1983, and 1985. (ECF No. 1). This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed on March 10, 2015, by Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges (ECF No. 13), to whom this case was previously assigned. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court summarily dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report on March 26, 2015. (ECF No. 15). This matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court has reviewed the Report and the objections. In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections.... The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the Objections. After careful review of the Report and Objections thereto, the Court hereby **ACCEPTS** the Report. (ECF No. 13). The Plaintiff's Objections (ECF No. 15) are **OVERRULED**. For the reasons stated in the Report, the Plaintiff's Complaint is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (ECF No. 1).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

June 10, 2015
Columbia, South Carolina

s/Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge